

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/742,684		MATHEWS ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Ruixiang Li		1646	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Ruixiang Li. (3) Stephen E. Reiter.
 (2) Gary Kunz. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 18 May 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 11 and 18-36.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kondo et al., Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun. 161:1267-1272, 1989.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: (i) the rejection of claims 11, 21, and 27-34 under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st paragraph (scope of enablement and written description), (ii) the rejection of claims 11 and 18-36 under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, and (iii) the rejection of claims 11, 21, 27, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Kondo et al., were discussed. The Examiner suggested an amendment to eliminate the hybridization language in the claims and to recite a percent identity with a specific functional limitation.